



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Labor and Commerce in Locke and Early Eighteenth-Century English Georgic

Citation for published version:

Irvine, R 2009, 'Labor and Commerce in Locke and Early Eighteenth-Century English Georgic' ELH, vol 76, no. 4, pp. 963-988. DOI: 10.1353/elh.0.0067

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1353/elh.0.0067](https://doi.org/10.1353/elh.0.0067)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

ELH

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Irvine, R. (2009). Labor and Commerce in Locke and Early Eighteenth-Century English Georgic. ELH, 76(4), 963-988doi: 10.1353/elh.0.0067

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





PROJECT MUSE®

Labor and Commerce in Locke and Early Eighteenth-Century English Georgic

Robert P. Irvine

ELH, Volume 76, Number 4, Winter 2009, pp. 963-988 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: 10.1353/elh.0.0067



➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/elh/summary/v076/76.4.irvine.html>

LABOR AND COMMERCE IN LOCKE AND EARLY EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH GEORGIC

BY ROBERT P. IRVINE

INTRODUCTION

This essay will argue that the revival of Virgilian georgic in English poetry at the start of the eighteenth century by John Philips and Alexander Pope must be understood in the context of the relationship between labor, commerce, and the state articulated by John Locke in chapter 5 of the *Second Treatise of Government* (1690, revised 1698). The first half of the essay argues that Locke's chapter on property in the *Second Treatise*, in the process of establishing the priority of property rights over political institutions, gives labor the rhetorical task of legitimating the money economy in the face of traditional (Aristotelian) objections. In this role, manual labor stands for, and naturalizes, a commercial system in which it is fully integrated, and which is historically and morally prior to the state. The second half of the essay will show that the representation of labor in *Cyder* by Philips (1708) and *Windsor Forest* by Pope (1713) must be understood in its dialectical relationship with both classical georgic and the assimilation of labor to commerce found in the *Second Treatise*. These poems use agricultural labor to naturalize the imperial state on the Virgilian model, but in doing so confront an alternative conceptualization of labor in which commerce, not politics, provides its ultimate moral horizon. This explains why commerce is prominent in Philips and Pope as it is not in Virgil: in their post-Lockean moment, the English poets must re-enclose the money economy within politics, necessarily evoking international commerce even as they subject it to various kinds of suppression and mystification.

By understanding *Cyder* and *Windsor Forest* in this context, I hope to supplement a recent essay by Pat Rogers, which identifies the specific party-political commitments encoded in these two poems, and thereby attaches their meaning firmly to the specific point in history at which they were published.¹ A great deal of excellent work has been done on eighteenth-century georgic in the last two decades, much of

it prompted by an interest in the role of empire in British culture in the period, or in the prehistory of Wordsworthian romanticism.² Yet because the British imperial project is assumed to be much the same in 1770 as in 1700, and because of the obvious dangers of teleology in literary history, both critical frameworks have the unfortunate effect of homogenizing eighteenth-century georgic verse, reading each poem as an example of a genre performing essentially the same ideological function throughout the period, and developing only in response to its own internal generic logic.³ I follow Rogers in returning these poems to their particular historical moment, but understand that moment in terms of the different conceptions of politics and commerce that it brought into opposition; conceptions that may find expression in, but do not simply correspond to, the party opposition between Whig and Tory in the last years of the reign of Queen Anne.

I. LABOR AND COMMERCE IN LOCKE'S *SECOND TREATISE*

The stated aim of chapter 5 of Locke's *Second Treatise* is to explain how a world given "to Mankind in common" could come to be divided up as the private property of individuals.⁴ Locke's initial assumption here is important for his ongoing refutation of Sir Robert Filmer's patriarchalism. If God gave the earth to Adam in particular, as his estate to divide and bequeath among his sons, then God gave the earth specifically to its patriarchs, from whom all kings are descended. Apologists for absolutist monarchy could use this to argue that the holding of private property was thus made possible by, and conditional on, the property-holder's subjection to the king.⁵ To counter this, Locke shows how private property could emerge before any such political relationship had been instituted. Locke argues that, in the state of nature, labor itself, whether the plucking of fruit or the plowing of ground, turns the earth and its products into the private property of the laborer without its being granted to him by any political superior. If legitimate property ownership exists prior to government, then government cannot make claims on private property without the collective consent of property owners.

The amount of property that can be claimed through labor on this basis is clearly quite limited, for purely practical reasons. But to this practical limitation Locke adds two moral provisos. The first proviso is implicit in Locke's denial that one man's appropriation of part of the world necessarily impoverishes everyone else, "at least where there is enough, and as good left in common for others" (*T*, 27.12–13;

this limitation is repeated at paragraph 33). This implies that where appropriation does not leave “enough and as good” for others, that appropriation is not legitimate. The second proviso stipulates that the property thus claimed is only legitimate so long as it is not then wasted: it must be used (a crop eaten or bartered, land worked) by the owner.⁶

The initial distribution of property thus made possible, and morally legitimated, by labor is clearly a very long way from what the *Second Treatise* itself calls the “disproportionate and unequal Possession of the Earth” actually pertaining in seventeenth century Europe (*T*, 50.5). Locke explains this unequal distribution as the consequence, not of an original unequal distribution by God, but of the introduction of money at some later date (but still, it should be noted, in the state of nature). Money is first invented as a way of storing up the value of perishable property, allowing it to be exchanged for imperishable tokens of gold or silver in a commercial transaction rather than bartered for other goods that would be themselves more or less perishable. Money thus allows the individual to legitimately claim as property a quantity of goods much greater than they could possibly use or consume themselves, since, as long as these can be sold and used by others, they have not gone to waste as a result.⁷

How money allows the private accumulation of land in the face of Locke’s first proviso, which demands that any act of appropriation leave “enough and as good” for others, is more difficult to explain. For money, once acquired in exchange for produce, can be spent on the acquisition of ever greater tracts of land which, in well-populated country, will inevitably not leave “enough and as good” for others. Locke’s argument on this point only coheres if we see both provisos as expressions, in the pre-money economy, of a more fundamental moral demand, which finds a different expression in the money economy. How that fundamental moral demand is understood has a large bearing on the type of social ethic Locke appears to promote. For C. B. Macpherson, this “prior principle” is “the natural right of every man to get the means of subsistence by his labour.”⁸ Before the introduction of money this has to mean a right to appropriate land; but once money is introduced it can be asserted just as well as the right to work for wages on someone else’s land. For Macpherson, Locke’s theory of the origins of property in labor is designed to naturalize the wage relationship, and the accumulation of capital by property-owners that it facilitates. The moral right to get subsistence by one’s labor becomes, in a money economy, the right to work for someone else’s profit; that which had

produced moral limitations on the behavior of property-owners before the invention of money no longer does so once it is introduced.

In contrast, more recent commentators have tended to emphasize the extent to which property-owners remain morally bound by concern for the common good even in a money economy. In Jeremy Waldron's account, for example, the fundamental moral demand understood to lie behind the two provisos is not the secular "natural right" that Macpherson describes, but a theological assumption; namely, that natural resources are not just there, to be exploited or not as it suits ourselves, but have been put there by God for our exploitation, so that by our labor we can make the world a better place for all humanity. This divinely ordained "teleology of natural resources" makes their exploitation for the common good not just a necessity, but a moral obligation.⁹ Waldron argues that both provisos are expressions of this obligation in the pre-money economy. The tendency of Locke's argument, says Waldron, suggests that the money economy is legitimate because it makes more of the fruits of the earth available even to those with the very least, in line with the justification for private property as such given in paragraph 37:

[H]e who appropriates land to himself by his labour, does not lessen but increase the common stock of mankind. For the provisions serving to the support of humane life, produced by one acre of inclosed and cultivated land, are . . . ten times more, than those, which are yielded by an acre of Land, of an equal richnesse, lying wast in common. (*T*, 37.11–16)

Hence also the famous passage in paragraph 41, citing the unprivatized land of native-held America: "a King of a large and fruitful Territory there feeds, lodges, and is clad worse than a day Laborer in *England*" (*T*, 41.8–10).

However, these disagreements about how exactly the money economy legitimates the private accumulation of land should not distract us from the radical nature of this mode of legitimation itself. What is at stake here is the moral legitimacy of owning any quantity of land greater than is necessary for the subsistence of an individual family; that is, of owning the kind of estates enjoyed by the seventeenth-century English gentry and aristocracy. For Locke, the moral legitimacy of the gentleman's estate is dependent on its full participation in a money economy.¹⁰ On this point, Locke is no longer arguing against Filmer, but breaking with a more exalted authority, namely Aristotle. For to raise the possibility of moral limits to property, and the effect

on these of the invention of money, is to call to mind the classical treatment of this topic in *Politics* 1256–58. There, Aristotle contrasts two types of property acquisition. One is “a natural part of household management” and the property acquired consists of “the goods that are necessary for life and useful to the community of city-state or household” (it should be noted that the “household”—*oikos*—seems to include its own agricultural land). Acquiring such “true wealth” necessarily involves exchange, between households or between city-states.¹¹ However, “[a]fter money was devised, necessary exchange gave rise to the second of the two kinds of wealth acquisition, commerce.”¹² And commerce is unnatural (it “does not exist by nature”) because it turns the acquisition of wealth into an end in itself, rather than a means to man’s natural end, namely living well.¹³ The amount of “true wealth” that is required “for the self-sufficiency that promotes the good life is not unlimited”; but because commerce treats wealth acquisition as its own end, the wealth acquired through commerce “is without limit.”¹⁴ Moreover, because the household functions as an analog for the city-state, the householder’s rule over the former is a precondition for his participating in the political life of the latter. The responsibilities of property-ownership give him the authority required to take part in government; and taking part in government, unlike the mere acquisition of wealth, is an ultimate good of human life.

Aristotle’s insistence on the moral priority of the political over the commercial, and the suspicion of the money economy that this generated, was not only current among the political ideas of Locke’s England but had been recently reformulated by its most influential republican thinker, James Harrington. Harrington’s *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656) argues that the political stability of a commonwealth depends on the regulation of the distribution of land, and not the distribution of property in general, because only land can feed men who can bear arms; and men will bear arms for whoever can feed them.¹⁵ That an army might be maintained on money seems to Harrington an impossibility. He comments elsewhere: “A bank never paid an army or, paying an army, quickly became no bank.”¹⁶ Harrington’s ideal constitution for England in *Oceana* is based on a wide distribution of land whose owners would be qualified for political participation by the economic, and thus military, self-sufficiency that their ownership of land afforded them, in a manner parallel to that in which their property qualified Aristotle’s householders for a role in the government of the city-state. Harrington’s version of English agrarian society was thus, argues J. G. A. Pocock, “at the service of a fundamentally Aristotelian theory of citizenship.”¹⁷

In the Aristotelian tradition, then, the *oikos* is prior to the money economy, both historically and morally; and, in part because of this, it has a particular political role to play that other types of property (such as goods and money) do not, as a moral qualification for participation in government (though different theorists within this tradition offer different accounts of why this is so). In Locke, the landed estate, or at least anything that a seventeenth-century gentleman would recognize as one, is only morally legitimate in a money economy. It is only commerce that makes the extensive ownership of land a means to the economic improvement of humanity as a whole, rather than a monument to waste and selfishness. Moreover, because the landed estate is legitimated by its efficient exploitation of natural resources, and not by its political effects, its unique political meaning disappears. Although property remains, *pace* Macpherson, “totally enshrouded in a network of moral obligations” even within a money economy, it is striking that Locke’s theory does not attach specifically political obligations to landed property.¹⁸ The landowner’s moral duty, according to Locke, is to utilize that property in the way that will maximize the common economic good; but there is no indication that his ownership of land gives him a special duty to pursue the common political good as Aristotle and Harrington insist. Locke’s theory of property in the *Second Treatise* thus stands in opposition not only to a Tory theory of royal prerogative, but also to an alternative Whig theory in the Aristotelian tradition.

Locke’s abolition of any moral difference between wealth in land and wealth in money or capital goods served a quite specific contemporary political purpose. Richard Ashcraft, in *Revolutionary Politics and Locke’s Two Treatises of Government* (1986), offers a sophisticated reading of the political context of the *Two Treatises*, namely the intensifying Whig resistance to Stuart absolutism in the 1680s. One of the Whigs’ political imperatives was to build an alliance between their own gentry and urban tradesmen and merchants, and “the theoretical problem of property rights had to be confronted and resolved in a manner that would satisfy both groups.”¹⁹ Indeed, this imperative explains more about Locke’s account of property than Ashcraft recognizes, ignoring as he does Locke’s underlying argument with Aristotle in his tight focus on the seventeenth-century milieu. Providing a moral justification for the ownership of the landed estate, but doing so in terms of its participation in a commercial economy as just one kind of property among many, establishes a conceptual continuity between land on the one hand and money and goods on the other. Locke thus provides an

ideological common ground on which landowners and merchants can come together for the defense of property rights in general.

This idea, that in a commercial society the responsibilities of landownership were those of property-ownership in general, is kept in circulation in the decades that follow in such influential media as Addison and Steele's *Spectator* (1711–12). Here it is dramatized in debates between a representative landed gentleman, Sir Roger de Coverley, and a merchant, Sir Andrew Freeport. In *Spectator* 174 (written by Steele), Sir Andrew is provoked by Sir Roger's slur against the merchant: "[W]hat can there great and noble be expected from him whose Attention is for ever fixed upon ballancing his Books, and watching over his Expences?"²⁰ Sir Andrew's response spells out the consequences of Locke's position in chapter 5 of the *Second Treatise*. Commerce is defended in terms of its contribution to the common good, and land placed firmly in the context of commerce. The merchant, explains Sir Andrew,

takes nothing from the industrious Labourer; he pays the poor Man for his Work; he communicates his Profit with Mankind; by the Preparation of his Cargo and the Manufacture of his Returns, he furnishes Employment and Subsistence to greater Numbers than the richest Nobleman; and even the Nobleman is obliged to him for finding out foreign Markets for the Produce of his Estate, and for making a great Addition to his Rents; and yet 'tis certain, that none of all these Things could be done by him without the Exercise of his Skill in Numbers.

This is the Oeconomy of the Merchant; and the Conduct of the Gentleman must be the same, unless by scorning to be the Steward, he resolves the Steward shall be the Gentleman.²¹

In a money economy, balancing their accounts is the primary social responsibility of merchant and landowner alike. Owning land is first and foremost one more kind of commercial activity.

Of course, an alliance of property-owners excluded the vast majority of the English population who owned no property. Ashcraft, emphasizing the social radicalism he finds in Locke's account of labor, allows the term to slip from signifying an abstract "industry" to identifying those who do manual labor for a living. Accordingly, he sees chapter 5's theory of property as involving "a rather radical endorsement of the claims of labor over those of land ownership."²² Yet while "Locke's general attitude toward manual labor . . . and toward those who worked in the mines or textile industries" may have been "overwhelmingly positive," the discussion of labor in the *Second Treatise* is really not about

them.²³ Ashcraft's best evidence comes from paragraph 43, which he quotes as follows: "It is 'the labor of those who broke the oxen, who digged and wrought the iron and stones, who felled and framed the timber,' and 'the ploughman's pains, the reaper and thresher's toil, and the baker's sweat' that provides the 'useful products' for 'the benefit of mankind.'" ²⁴ What Locke actually says is this:

[T]is not barely the Plough-man's Pains, the Reaper's and Thresher's Toil, and the Bakers Sweat, is to be counted into the *Bread* we eat; the Labour of those who broke the Oxen, who digged and wrought the Iron and Stones, who felled and framed the Timber employed about the Plough, Mill, Oven, or any other Utensils, which are a vast number, requisite to this Corn, from its being seed to be sown to its being made Bread, must all be *charged on* the account of *Labour*, and received as an effect of that: Nature and the Earth furnished only the almost worthless Materials, as in themselves. 'Twould be a strange *Catalogue of things, that Industry provided and made use of, about every Loaf of Bread*, before it came to our use, if we could trace them; Iron, Wood, Leather, Bark, Timber, Stone, Bricks, Coals, Lime, Cloth, Dying-Drugs, Pitch, Tar, Masts, Ropes, and all the Materials made use of in the Ship, that brought any of the Commodities made use of by any of the Workmen, to any part of the Work; all which, it would be almost impossible, at least too long, to reckon up. (*T*, 43.13–29)

This passage certainly grants a real moral dignity to the laborers whose work makes natural resources useful to their society. But the central object of Locke's eulogy here is the commercial system that makes use of the laborers. From the first line quoted, Locke emphasizes that it is not only those involved in its immediate production whose labor makes possible our daily bread, but the labor of many others as well, organized in a complex pattern of exchange. By the end of the passage, the "commodities" in question are not the goods produced by the workmen, but the tools and materials that the workmen use: made available to them, not only by the labor of their fellow workers, but also by the trading network within which their labor takes place. This emphasis appears again in paragraph 48, in the course of another demonstration of the necessity of money for extended private estates:

What would a Man value Ten Thousand, or an Hundred Thousand Acres of excellent *Land*, ready cultivated, and well stocked too with Cattle, in the middle of the in-land Parts of *America*, where he had no hopes of Commerce with other Parts of the World, to draw *Money* to him by Sale of the Product? It would not be worth the inclosing, and we should see him give up again to the wild Common of Nature,

whatever was more than would supply the Conveniences of Life to be had there for him and his Family. (T, 48.17–26)

The point is that most labor would not take place if commerce did not provide a market for its produce. The merchant does not appear as an agent in either of the passages above. Yet, if “labor” is defined as that activity that fulfills God’s purposes by making natural resources useful to humankind, then the work of the merchant too is “labor”; so is the work of the landowner, for that matter, insofar as he too is engaged in commerce. Thus the effect of understanding Locke’s account of labor in terms of its fulfillment of a teleology of natural resources is to strip specifically manual labor of the unique, originating role in the production of value that the early paragraphs of chapter 5 appear to grant it. What differentiates manual labor from other areas of commercial activity is the moral significance ascribed to it by scripture, which provides Locke with his starting point. Locke’s rhetorical strategy in his chapter on property, then, is to use “labor” as a synecdoche for commerce, so that the moral meaning of plowing and reaping can be extended to trading and banking as well.

In 1698 Locke added a marginal comment to the third printing of the *Two Treatises*, which gestures towards the political effects that the recognition of property rights must have:

This shews, how much numbers of men are to be preferred to largeness of dominions, and that the increase of lands, and the right employing of them is the great art of government. And that Prince who shall be so wise and godlike as by established laws of liberty to secure protection and encouragement to the honest industry of Mankind against the oppression of power and narrowness of Party will quickly be too hard for his neighbours. But this bye the bye. (T, 42.21–28)

Briefly, and “bye the bye,” the claims of “industry” appear, not as natural rights prior to the claims of politics, but as a means to a political end, namely the aggrandizement of the kingdom in its economic and military competition with others. At this point Locke encloses his theory of property within the terms of what, after the emergence of “classical” political economy, would retrospectively be named “mercantilist” thinking. “The ultimate *ends* of mercantilist policies were to strengthen the external power of the state. This was explicitly contradictory to Adam Smith and liberal economics which preferred the wealth of the individual before the wealth of the nation-state.”²⁵ The appearance of a mercantilist logic in the 1698 edition of the *Two*

Treatises, but not in the original version, is of course related to the change of management in Britain that had occurred in the meantime: the United Kingdom of 1698, unlike the Stuart tyranny of the 1680s, was one whose strengthening was to be welcomed rather than feared. Yet the mercantilist assumption that a principal purpose of private economic endeavor is to enhance the resources and power of government remains rhetorically at odds with the argument of the *Treatise* as a whole, that a principle purpose of government is the security of private economic endeavor.

I will now argue that this mercantilist moment in Locke's 1698 revision of the *Treatise* is repeated in the history of English poetry as what one could call the georgic moment of John Philips's *Cyder* (1708) and Alexander Pope's *Windsor Forest* (1713). Both poems, like the 1698 addendum, re-enclose the idea of labor within a political (military, imperial) horizon of meaning. However, the poems do this in order to reassert, *contra* Locke, the moral difference of land from other kinds of property. Here too the period's shifting modes of government provide an informing context. By the turn of the century, Harrington's claim that "a bank never paid an army" had been spectacularly refuted. The new military-fiscal state was precisely a mechanism whereby the banks, by facilitating government debt, could pay an army.²⁶ For the "country ideology" formed in (permanent) opposition to this state, this development, rather than putting commercial enterprise in the service of state power, was putting state power in the service of commercial enterprise, raising to public prominence

a Species of Men quite different from any that were ever known before the Revolution; consisting either of Generals and Colonels, or of such whose whole Fortunes lie in Funds and Stocks: So that *Power*, which, according to the old Maxim, was used to follow *Land*, is now gone over to *Money*.²⁷

Here Jonathan Swift, on taking over *The Examiner* in 1710, laments the loss in practice of the special political meaning of landownership that Locke had dismantled in theory just two decades before. *Cyder* and *Windsor Forest*, while influential in their revival of georgic for the English eighteenth century generally, also occupy a quite specific historical moment that they share with Swift (and with *The Spectator*). This moment is defined by the closing stages of the War of the Spanish Succession, certainly, but it is also a post-Lockean one. The turn to Virgil offers a way of figuring the moral priority of land that Swift sees being eroded by the money economy by returning agri-

cultural labor to its Virgilian role as political symbol. But because Lockean discourse has already inscribed labor as an element within the money economy, Philips and Pope can only reassert the political difference of land from other types of property by also asserting the autonomy of agriculture from the circulation of commodities that the money economy makes possible. Locke's *Second Treatise* provides a crucial context for early English georgic, because the priority of the commercial over the political for which it argues is just what these poems set out to reverse.

II. REFIGURING LABOR IN EARLY ENGLISH GEORGIC

English georgic verse, like chapter 5 of the *Second Treatise*, invests agricultural labor with an originating social role, not in order to raise the status of the laborer, but to provide a point of rhetorical leverage in debates internal to the propertied classes. That georgic verse is uninterested in the people who actually do the work of plowing, sowing and harvesting is indeed the starting point of many recent discussions of the genre. Rachel Crawford, for example, observes that English georgic engages in the "gentrification" of agricultural work, the appropriation of labor to signify values that attach to gentlemen, rather than attempting its "accurate portrayal" in its own right.²⁸ The question raised by this observation is why, given their gentlemanly lack of interest in actual labor, eighteenth-century English poets should bother with Virgilian georgic at all. One answer is suggested by the discussion of Locke above. At stake in the representation of labor in this period is the legitimation of the money economy and the reconceptualization of society in commercial terms. Any writing concerned to resist these moves could do so by reappropriating "labor" as a term and giving it a different political valence. Virgilian georgic addressed a constellation of concerns that overlapped with those of Locke's chapter 5, and thereby offered a rhetorical context in which the authority of the Roman poet could be exploited to reassert an alternative social vision to that expressed by Locke.

Certainly there is another, and more obvious, circumstance that explains the turn to the *Georgics* at this particular point in history, namely the rapid expansion of England's (after 1707, Britain's) ability to project military power on the world stage in the reigns of William and Anne. Already in 1697, notes Karen O'Brien, Dryden's translation of Virgil "precipitated a major reorientation of georgic toward imperial concerns."²⁹ These concerns are not prominent in the looser

seventeenth-century uses of georgic, which, as described by Antony Low and Alastair Fowler, look as often to Hesiod as to Virgil.³⁰ They are however prominent in Virgil's own verse. Octavian's ongoing war in the east, among other things a war of conquest over Egypt, is referred to in each of the four georgics. Each of Virgil's poems also uses war as a source of images for rural labor: the plowman is "ever at his post to discipline the ground, and give his orders to the fields"; vines are to be organized in ranks like troops; nomadic shepherds carry everything with them like Roman soldiers; and the industrious bees of book 4 get a whole war to themselves.³¹ Most importantly of all, in the second Georgic, hardy soldiers are described as a product of the fertile Italian soil as much as its grain and gold, up to and including Octavian himself:

She has mothered a vigorous breed of men, Marsians and Sabine stock, the Ligurian, inured to hardship, and the Volscian spearmen . . . hardy warriors, and you, greatest of all, Caesar, who, already victorious in Asia's furthest bounds, now drive the craven Indian from the hills of Rome. Hail, land of Saturn, mighty mother of crops, mighty mother of men. (G, 2:167–174)

In Virgilian georgic, labor naturalizes and legitimates imperial expansion, because the military flowing-out of the Roman nation into heroic conquest is imagined as similar to the rich superfluity of its agriculture. The farmer subduing the soil with the plow, and the soldier subduing the rebellious border province with the sword, provide metaphors for each other. On the other hand, although its existence is occasionally implied, trade is a theme absent from the *Georgics*. There, the teleology of natural resources finds its fulfillment not in commerce, as in Locke, but in military and political aggression.

Yet it was possible to write poems in praise of Britain's new imperial self-assertion without reaching for Virgil and the "connections between the rhythms of country life and the renewal . . . of . . . imperial civilization" that Dryden's version emphasized.³² The poetry that twentieth-century critics named "Whig panegyric" hymned British victories over France, and the commercial wealth that followed from dominance of the sea, without relating these glories to the work of domestic agriculture.³³ The appeal of Virgilian georgic for Philips and Pope lay in the resources it offered for legitimating a certain beleaguered version of the land by reference to an uncontroversial British maritime supremacy, rather than its ability to legitimate empire by reference to the taken-for-granted values signified by the British coun-

tryside. What seemed beleaguered about land was, as we have seen, its claim to a unique role in the politics of the nation. To defend this in georgic terms, through the figure of the agricultural laborer, was to enter into competition with the rival understanding of labor given expression by Locke. That the meaning of labor might consist in its material role in commercial networks; that agriculture might be just one type of productive activity among many; and that land might thus be just one kind of property among many; these possibilities prompt, and haunt, Philips's and Pope's deployment of labor in a Virgilian symbolic economy of empire.

This becomes apparent at those points where *Cyder* addresses the importation of commodities to Britain. The first of *Cyder's* two books follows the schema of the second *Georgic* as discussed above: first the properly georgic matter of agricultural instruction, in this case regarding the care of orchards; and then the political eulogy of Britain's own "vigorous breed of men," a pantheon of Tory grandees. It is in the turn from the first section to the second, from apples to aristocrats, that the possibility emerges of a commercial context for the Herefordshire countryside hymned by Philips. The turn is constituted by the following passage, which begins in praise of cider itself:

What shou'd we wish for more? or why, in quest
Of Foreign Vintage, insincere, and mixt,
Traverse th' extreamest World? Why tempt the Rage
Of the rough Ocean? when our native Glebe
Imparts, from bounteous Womb, annual Recruits
Of Wine delectable, that far surmounts
Gallic, or *Latin* Grapes, or those that see
The setting Sun near *Calpe's* tow'ring Height.
Nor let the *Rhodian*, nor the *Lesbian* Vines
Vaunt their rich Must, nor let *Tokay* contend
For Sov'ranty; *Phanæus* self must bow
To th' *Ariconian* Vales: And shall we doubt
T' improve our vegetable Wealth, or let
The Soil lie idle, which, with fit Manure,
Will largest Usury repay, alone
Impower'd to supply what nature asks
Frugal, or what nice Appetite requires?³⁴

The poem continues, a little later:

Next add the *Sylvan* Shades, and silent Groves,
(Haunt of the *Druids*) whence the Hearth is fed
With copious Fuel; whence the sturdy Oak,

A Prince's Refuge once, th' æternal Guard
 Of *England's* Throne, by sweating Peasants fell'd,
 Stems the vast Main, and bears tremendous War
 To distant Nations, or with Sov'ran Sway
 Aws the divided World to Peace and Love.
 Why shoul'd the *Chalybes*, or *Bilboa* boast
 Their harden'd Iron; when our Mines produce
 As perfect Martial Ore? Can *Tmolus'* Head
 Vie with our Safron Odours? Or the Fleece
Bætic, or finest *Tarentine*, compare
 With *Lemster's* silken Wool? Where shall we find
 Men more undaunted, for their country's Weal
 More prodigal of Life? In ancient Days,
 The *Roman* Legions, and great *Cæsar* found
 Our Fathers no mean Foes[.]³⁵

The second passage here is Virgilian on several levels. As in Virgil, heroic warriors are included in the catalog of the country's produce. Indeed, in their production of timber for warships, Philips's sweating peasants contribute materially, and not just symbolically, to the imperial war-economy. Additionally, the closely proximate references to both the Chalybes and to the saffron of Mount Tmolus evokes, if it does not exactly quote, Virgil's first *Georgic*, where they are both mentioned within a few lines: "nonne vides, croceos ut Tmolus odores, / India mittit ebur, molles sua tura Sabaei, / at Chalybes nudi ferrum": "See you not, how Tmolus sends us saffron fragrance, India her ivory, the soft Sabaeans their frankincense: but the naked Chalybes give us iron . . . ?" (G, 1:56–58). In the first passage from *Cyder* quoted above, lines 538–41 also allude to the *Georgics*, this time to book 2, where Virgil discusses vines: "On our trees hangs not the same vintage as Lesbos gathers from Methymna's boughs" (G, 2:89–90); "There are, too, Aminnean vines, soundest of wines, to which the Tmolian and the royal Phanaean itself pay homage" (G, 2:97–98); "Nor would I pass by you, wine of Rhodes, welcome to the gods and the banquet's second course" (G, 2:101–2).

In both passages, Philips compares English produce, as Virgil compares Italian produce, with goods from abroad. There are two significant differences between the English poem and the Latin one in this regard. In the first passage, "Foreign Vintage" is not only a point of comparison with English cider: it is a commodity that English merchants take risks to import, and Philips argues that this is unnecessary. That Italian wines ought to be substituted for those imported from elsewhere is not a thought that occurs to Virgil. That wines are

commodities traded between different localities is perhaps implied by this passage from *Georgics* book 2, but this is not its point, which is merely that different places are suited to growing different kinds of grape. Similarly, in the passage from book 1, Virgil's verb "mittit" (G, 1:57) includes the meaning "sends" as well as the broader "gives" or "produces" (an ambiguity which Fairclough acknowledges by translating it twice, once in each way).³⁶ But the point is the same one: that different countries produce different commodities just as different soils are good for growing different crops.

Admittedly, lines 572–89 of *Cyder* do not explicitly refer to commerce as do the earlier lines quoted above. But the poem does repeat the odd conjunction of allusion to the classical world with reference to goods actually traded into eighteenth-century England. This is the second difference between this section of *Cyder* and the passages from the *Georgics* from which it borrows. The continental and Mediterranean wines referred to in lines 530–41 were indeed a significant sector of British imports. But the classicizing diction in which it describes them ("Gallic" and "Latin" rather than French and Italian; a reference to Mons Calpe rather than to Gibraltar) is carried over into the citation of Greek islands whose wines, however important in the ancient world, were hardly prominent in European markets at the start of the eighteenth century, thanks to three hundred years of Muslim Turkish rule. Rather, the wines of Lesbos and Rhodes are here because they are in Virgil. Similarly, in lines 580–85, the iron of Bilbao, and "Bætic" (southern Spanish) wool, refer to contemporary imports (Basque steel was famous, and iron from Northern Spain had been exported to England since the sixteenth century; Spain also produced fine wools).³⁷ But the Chalybes of ancient Anatolia, credited with inventing iron-working, are an allusion to Virgil, as we have seen; Tarentum (Taranto) in southern Italy was famous as the source of the purple dye used for Roman robes of state, but the modern Italian textile industry was based in the cities of the North. In the second quoted passage Philips pairs off contemporary Spanish imports with references to their classical equivalents, just as in the first he moves from wines imported to Augustan Britain to wines imported to Augustan Rome: commodities materially present in the British marketplace are brought onto the same rhetorical plane as those present in the classical world. Underlying this procedure seems to be the same anxiety about rivalry between domestic production and imported goods as was made explicit in the treatment of wine, since the same tactic is adopted to suppress it.³⁸ Worries about economic competition with the continent

are subsumed under the poem's less troubling literary relation to its generic antecedent, as a native British production borrowing its literary authority from a classical precursor.

A similar procedure is apparent in the conclusion of book 2 and thus of the whole poem. Here Philips celebrates the global power which will be enjoyed by the state created by the parliamentary union of Scotland and England the previous year:

uncontrol'd

The *British* Navy thro' the Ocean vast
 Shall wave her double Cross, t' extreamest Climes
 Terrific, and return with odorous Spoils
 Of *Araby* well fraught, or *Indus'* Wealth,
 Pearl, and Barbaric Gold; mean while the Swains
 Shall unmolested reap, what Plenty strows
 From well stor'd Horn, rich Grain, and timely Fruits.
 The elder Year, *Pomona*, pleas'd, shall deck
 With ruby-tinctur'd Births, whose liquid Store
 Abundant, flowing in well blended Streams,
 The Natives shall applaud; while glad they talk
 Of baleful Ills, caus'd by *Bellona's* Wrath
 In other Realms; where-e'er the *British* spread
 Triumphant Banners, or their Fame has reach'd
 Diffusive, to the utmost Bounds of this
 Wide Universe, *Silurian* Cyder borne
 Shall please all Tasts, and triumph o'er the Vine.³⁹

The poem ends by recapitulating the rivalry between English cider and continental wine, although the battle between them is now to be fought in a global arena, like Britain's actual wars with France and Spain, rather than in the domestic market. Book 2 thus ends by emphasizing the expanding military-political horizon within which both agricultural labor and international commerce take place. Indeed, commerce seems to be granted a new legitimacy in this imperial context, as the prospect of an export market for cider appears as a marker of Britain's new global dominance. The mention of shipbuilding in book 1 is followed by a passage denying the need to import steel, textiles and so on; here, it seems at first glance that the expansion of British naval power will rather facilitate imports (spices, pearls, gold), and that this is to be welcomed rather than condemned as a threat to domestic production. But of course these lines once again slip rapidly from contemporary economic reference (spices imported from the East) into literary allusion: book 2 of *Paradise Lost* begins by telling us that Satan's throne "Outshone the wealth of Ormus and of Ind, /

Or where the gorgeous East with richest hand / Showers on her kings barbaric pearl and gold[.]” Any lines of poetry which imagine the east as a source of precious metals for Britain are in any case advertising their distance from well-known economic realities: British imports of Indian cottons and silks were controversially paid for by exporting silver and gold.⁴⁰ Among the things by which the laboring swains will remain unmolested, it seems, are the commodities of any actual Levantine or East Indian trade.

When *Cyder* dismisses imports as unnecessary in book 1, and when it celebrates them as the returns of empire in book 2, it adopts the same rhetorical tactic. In sharp contrast to the detailed particularity with which it describes indigenous agriculture, the poem denies the materiality of imported goods by assimilating them to an ideal realm of literary reference. Accordingly, native labor here appears just as unaffected by any new imported commodities as it is by the entry of its own produce into these new global channels. In contrast to paragraph 43 of the *Second Treatise*, where labor is dependent on trading networks for its means and markets, Philips evokes commerce precisely in order to demonstrate indigenous labor’s independence of it. Exports (cider) appear not as commodities to trade but as the overflow of a native agricultural plenitude continuous with Britain’s military-political expansion, a “liquid Store / Abundant,” “flowing” to the ends of the earth by means of the British navy. Imports, meanwhile, are turned into vehicles for literary allusion.⁴¹ The conclusion of *Cyder* indeed elucidates the logic of this displacement as it previously appeared in book 1. The unmolested swain remains outside the circuits of world commerce because his work represents a material self-sufficiency that is imagined as the source of Britain’s global political authority. By insisting on the autonomy of agricultural labor from commerce, but relating it symbolically to imperial war, *Cyder* thus reasserts the special political status that agricultural land enjoys in Aristotelian (in this period, to use Pocock’s term, “neo-Harringtonian”) thinking, and which was abolished in the *Second Treatise*. Material self-sufficiency is aligned with political authority for the nation of Great Britain just as for the *oikos* or the landed estate.⁴² Book 1 even includes a sly suggestion of the autonomy of agriculture from the money economy as such. The “Usury” of line 544 is the “Manure” of the previous line: finance appears as a metaphor for fertilizer and not the other way around. There is no question here that agricultural improvement might require the borrowing of money. The choice of metaphor necessarily raises this possibility, but only so that it can be refused.

Pope's *Windsor Forest* (1713) is not georgic in form, uninterested as it is in the details of agricultural practice explored by Philips. But it follows the precedent of *Cyder* in other important respects, including the earlier poem's tactics for denying the commercial embeddedness of agricultural labor asserted by Locke. This is all the more striking since *Windsor Forest*'s version of English history reproduces, rather than contests, the central idea of chapter 5 of the *Second Treatise*: the basis in labor of private property. Lines 43–92 describe the depredations of England's first feudal overlords, the Norman kings, and what is wrong with the Normans is that under their rule, "The Swain with Tears his frustrate Labour yields, / And famish'd dies amidst his ripen'd Fields"; following which, "The Fields are ravish'd from th'industrious Swains" to make way for deer forests.⁴³ The result is that potentially productive land is left, or reverts to, waste. However, "Succeeding Monarchs" (presumably the Tudors and Stuarts)

heard the Subjects Cries,
Nor saw displeas'd the peaceful Cottage rise.
Then gath'ring Flocks on unknown Mountains fed,
O'er sandy Wilds were yellow Harvests spread,
The Forests wonder'd at th'unusual Grain,
And secret Transport touch'd the conscious Swain.
Fair *Liberty*, *Britannia's* Goddess, rears
Her chearful Head, and leads the golden Years.
(WF, 85–92)

Agricultural labor figures in *Windsor Forest* not as material practice but as that which is unchained by "Liberty." As in Locke, waste land being put under the plow is the setting of political freedom: wise political rule consists in encouraging industry by the recognition of property rights, although in Pope the moment of this recognition is pushed back from the reign of William III to that of Henry VII. Similarly, in the previous verse paragraph, the present Thames valley's agricultural profusion speaks of the benign political order: "Rich Industry sits smiling on the Plains, / And Peace and Plenty tell, a STUART reigns" (WF, 41–42).

However, while farmers may enjoy the rights of private property, this property seems in no danger of being put into circulation in a money economy. Though international commerce has already been evoked in this verse paragraph, the terms of that evocation are, as in *Cyder*, those of literary convention rather than contemporary economic discourse.

Let *India* boast her Plants, not envy we
 The weeping Amber or the balmy Tree,
 While by our Oaks the precious Loads are born,
 And Realms commanded which those Trees adorn.
 (WF, 29–32)

It will be no surprise that the allusion to Indian amber and balm does not reflect the importance of commodities actually traded by the East India Company. Rather, it is yet another echo of the *Georgics*, of the same passage in book 2 from which Philips draws his reference to Rhodian and Lesbian wine: “Trees have their allotted climes. India alone bears black ebony; to the Sabeaens alone belongs the frankincense bough. Why should I tell you of the balsams that drip from the fragrant wood?” (G, 2:116–19). As in *Cyder*, *Windsor Forest*’s Virgilian allusion points up an important difference between the English poem and the Roman one. Ebony and frankincense and balsam are in Virgil as evidence that different types of tree thrive in different climates; they are not there in the first instance as commodities traded into Italy from abroad. Pope follows Philips in explicitly referring to an import trade as Virgil never does, while using the classical allusion to efface the material specificity of what is imported. Commerce returns to view in Old Father Thames’s vision of Britain’s future that forms the climax of *Windsor Forest*. The terms in which it is represented once again closely follow Philips. The double cross of the Union is again carried by the navy to the poles and the tropics, and the returns from these endeavors are once again described in generic rather than specific terms, though this time without any precise literary allusion:

For me the Balm shall bleed, and Amber flow,
 The Coral redden, and the Ruby glow,
 The Pearly Shell its lucid Globe infold,
 And *Phœbus* warm the ripening Ore to Gold.
 (WF, 393–96)

Once again, the reality of Britain’s global commercial interests is evoked only for the place of the actual goods traded to be taken by conventional signifiers of oriental otherness.

Where Pope goes beyond Philips is in expanding the modest aesthetic returns of empire that appear at the end of *Cyder* into full-blown imperial spectacle. Not only are the Thames-side “swains” tending flocks and reaping grain “unmolested” as in Philips (WF, 369–70), the restoration of private property to the laborer is to be an effect of benign British government abroad as it has been at home:

Oh stretch thy Reign, fair *Peace!* from Shore to Shore,
 Till Conquest cease, and Slav'ry be no more:
 Till the freed *Indians* in their native Groves
 Reap their own Fruits, and woo their Sable Loves[.]
 (WF, 407–10)

The fantasy of granting the subjects of Spanish imperial rule the right to “reap their own Fruits” allows the poem to contrast Lockean constitutionalism, where owning property provides the subject with a bulwark against the power of the state, with continental absolutism. Yet for all that liberty, here as earlier in the poem, is imagined as free appropriation through labor, still the climax of the poem encloses this within a celebration of the power of the imperial state, as it is acknowledged by the liberated Indians themselves, along the lines set up at the end of the previous verse paragraph:

There mighty Nations shall inquire their Doom,
 The World's great Oracle in Times to come;
 There Kings shall sue, and suppliant States be seen
 Once more to bend before a *British QUEEN*.
 (WF, 381–84)

In lines 403–6, these become the “Feather'd People”, “naked Youths and painted Chiefs” of the new world, come to pay their respects to the old. The effect of these images of political homage on either side of the conventional catalog of balm, amber, coral and gold is to turn such commodities into signs of Britain's political supremacy rather than its commercial reach. The mention of “two fair cities” in line 379 reminds the reader of the two distinct functions of the English metropolis: as political capital (the city of Westminster) and commercial center (the city of London). But coral, rubies, and gold were comparatively rare among the textiles, spices, coffee, and sugar being unloaded on the quaysides of the City of London. Their appearance on the Thames instead functions in the same way as that of the “painted Chiefs” and “suppliant States” (who are seen to submit to Anne): as a spectacle of tribute, as aesthetic signs of the political-military hegemony to be exercised over the world from Westminster. Entirely enclosed within the poem's political rhetoric, the allusion to commerce provides no more than another image of the centripetal organization of courtly rule. *Windsor Forest's* account of agriculture and empire is articulated through the *dramatis personae* of chapter 5 of the *Second Treatise*: the day laborer and the American king.⁴⁴ But they do not appear here for the purposes of economic comparison as in Locke, but as signi-

fiers of a beneficent political order. The possibility that the gratefully property-owning Indian and his industrious Berkshire counterpart might be connected through the networks of global trade is raised by the Lockean terms in which they are defined. But in place of this possible connection the poem asserts their common subjection to the British state as their only true relation. The crucial subordination enacted in Father Thames's oration is not that of the Indian to Queen Anne, but of London to Westminster, of commerce as a category to politics as such.

Windsor Forest, with its celebration of the court, seems an unlikely recruit to the "country" or "neo-Harringtonian" corpus to which *Cyder* certainly belongs. 1713, the year before the accession of the House of Hanover and the entrenchment of the Whigs in power, is indeed the last moment for a generation when a Tory might write a poem in praise of the court. In Pope's poem, imperial glory is conspicuously displayed at the empire's center; in Philips's, on the other hand, the British state itself only becomes visible at its imperial frontier. Yet in both works the transformation of imported commodities into aesthetic effects, as literary allusion (Philips) or courtly spectacle (Pope), serves to disarm the threatening autonomy of modern commerce and to employ it in the celebration of a political order based on land. Similarly, the Virgilian-georgic figuration of labor, as a means of naturalizing an imperial political order rather than as an element in a system of commerce, does the same ideological work in both texts. The apparent contrast between what Pellicer calls "Pope's cosmopolitan vision" and Philips's "isolationist stance" masks the shared determination of the two poems to isolate agriculture from the currents of world trade, and in doing so to defend the moral and political difference of land from other, more mobile, types of property to which Locke assimilates it.⁴⁵ Whereas Locke uses the laborer to collapse the difference between the landowner and the merchant, Philips and Pope use the laborer to reassert the political difference of the landed estate from property in goods and money.

CONCLUSION

Reading *Cyder* and *Windsor Forest* in this way makes clear the extent to which the first eighteenth-century English exercises in georgic serve ideological purposes quite specific to their historical moment, and therefore cannot be simply subsumed into a tradition that includes James Thomson and John Dyer, for example. Poems like *The Seasons* (1730–1746) and *The Fleece* (1757) make no bones about the participa-

tion of rural labor in international commerce.⁴⁶ Recent studies have emphasized the ambivalence of such poems towards commerce and its effects on British society, simultaneously committed as they often are to a modernizing and imperial Britain for which commerce was the engine of wealth and power and to a civic humanist discourse within which commercial wealth could only figure as a source of moral corruption. For Suvir Kaul, Thomson's verse "does primarily create functional mythologies of the power of trade" but "also *betrays* them, enacting, in its dynamic and changing movement, attendant tensions and anxieties."⁴⁷ Dustin Griffin similarly finds in Dyer's *Fleece* a "vision of commercial Britain" as a "community of labour," "shadowed, like Thomson's, with doubts and misgivings about the fate of a trading nation" which was learning to enjoy "the dubious delights of consumer luxuries."⁴⁸ Such ambivalence about the effects of a trading economy is however quite different from what we have found in *Cyder* and *Windsor Forest*, which work to isolate native agriculture from international commerce altogether.

The broader implications of my argument appear if we consider English Virgilian georgic's relation to Locke as an encounter between neoclassical genre and enlightenment discourse; and specifically, that type of enlightenment discourse which takes labor and commerce as its objects of knowledge and will come to be known as political economy. John Barrell understands the problem represented by Thomson's work in just this context. Faced with a society composed of a proliferating number of specialist occupations and interest groups, Thomson wants to position the landed gentleman as the one type of citizen who enjoys a comprehensive overview of the social whole, unrestricted by any particular vocational commitment. But Thomson's verse is unable to share this perspective with its readers, because these privileged observers

lack any language . . . to describe the variety of society in terms which will represent that society as unified and harmonious. The missing term, I suggest, is labour, is industry: the retired gentleman cannot easily see that if society is a unified pattern of opposing elements, that unity proceeds from the variety and therefore the interdependence of its specialized labours, as it is understood in terms of an economic model of society.⁴⁹

Barrell assumes that this lack is historically conditioned: "[I]t was not until it became possible to understand the structure of modern society in economic terms that the various discrete elements imagined as composing it could be understood as productive of its unity."⁵⁰ It

seems that a discourse of labor in an economic sense was simply not available to Thomson in 1746 when the last version of *The Seasons* was published, thirty years before Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*. Yet in an important way such an economic version of labor had already been put in circulation by Locke. What Barrell describes as a discursive lack in Thomson is felt by *Cyder* and *Windsor Forest* as a discursive pressure from without, in opposition to which the georgic project of these poems is defined. Rather than georgic verse attempting (and failing) what Smithian political economy would later accomplish, the currency of an economic figuration of labor is a determining context for the turn to Virgilian georgic from the start.

Indeed, later georgic writing may be understood as rejecting the Virgilian figuration of labor to precisely the extent that georgic is itself absorbed by enlightenment discursive practices. Beth Fowkes Tobin has recently argued that eighteenth-century English georgic verse "participated in the Enlightenment redefinition of knowledge as abstract and universal" by effacing the farmer as the subject of agricultural knowledge and putting the learned gentleman in his place.⁵¹ If this is so, it is because the Virgilian model retrieved by Philips and Pope is subsequently dismembered by what we can call, following Kurt Heinzelman, "Georgian" cultural categories. Heinzelman argues that the enlightenment division of *intellectual* labor, and particularly its splitting of professional and practical disciplines from aesthetics, meant that the *Georgics* came to be read as mixing two distinct discourses: science (how to farm) and "literature" (everything else).⁵² Heinzelman suggests, as this essay has in part confirmed, that "earlier in the eighteenth century" a more strictly Virgilian georgic was still visible, in which "belles lettres and science might find a common discursive ground."⁵³ Yet once again our reading of Philips and Pope with Locke qualifies such simple chronology. For these poets, science and art may indeed meet on the common ground of agriculture, but sunder when the enlightenment gaze moves from the turning of soil to the turning of profits. At that point, the role of georgic verse becomes to suppress and obscure the economic or scientific conception of labor articulated by Locke. The method of doing so, translating the objects of commercial discourse into an aesthetic register, already recognizes economics and aesthetics as distinct and opposing discursive practices. *Cyder* and *Windsor Forest* already render georgic as aesthetic or literary in a specialized and un-Virgilian sense, precisely by putting it to work in the containment of an enlightenment mode of knowledge.

University of Edinburgh

NOTES

¹ See Pat Rogers, "John Philips, Pope, and Political Georgic," *Modern Language Quarterly* 66 (2005): 411–42.

² On georgic and empire, see Karen O'Brien, "Imperial Georgic, 1660–1789," in *The Country and the City Revisited*, ed. Gerald MacLean, Donna Landry, and Joseph P. Ward (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), 160–79; and Suvir Kaul, *Poems of Nation, Anthems of Empire: English Verse in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Charlottesville: Univ. Press of Virginia, 2000). On eighteenth-century georgic and romanticism, see Kurt Heinzelman, "Roman Georgic in the Georgian Age: A Theory of Romantic Genre," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 33 (1991): 182–214; and Kevis Goodman, *Georgic Modernity and British Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004).

³ See, for example, Rachel Crawford's overview, in which the development of English georgic in the half century to John Dyer's *The Fleece* (1757) itself constitutes an acting-out of the georgic *topos*: "The declension from Philips's sheltered orchards into the world of trade depicted in *The Fleece* recapitulates the essential georgic theme elaborated by Virgil and Milton: painful labor is the consequence of expulsion from a garden . . . an ejection from a benign world in which labor is sweet delight" (*Poetry, Enclosure, and the Vernacular Landscape, 1700–1830* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002], 115).

⁴ John Locke, *Second Treatise in Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967), paragraph 25, line 18. Hereafter abbreviated *T* and cited parenthetically by paragraph and line number.

⁵ See Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991), 2, 129.

⁶ See Locke, 31.

⁷ Thus meeting the requirements of the second proviso. See Locke, 46.28–30.

⁸ C. B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 213.

⁹ Jeremy Waldron, *God, Locke, and Equality: Christian Foundations in Locke's Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 159–60.

¹⁰ The ostensible qualification for the parliamentary franchise in Locke's England was freehold of land worth 40 shillings per annum in rent or membership of a city corporation. I think I am safe in assuming that a 40-shilling freehold would fall foul of Locke's first proviso without a money economy to legitimate it.

¹¹ Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. C. D. C. Reeve (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1998), 14 (1256b27–28).

¹² Aristotle, 16 (1257b1–2).

¹³ Aristotle, 15 (1257a16–17).

¹⁴ Aristotle, 17 (1257b24–25).

¹⁵ See James Harrington, *The Commonwealth of Oceana and A System of Politics*, ed. J. G. A. Pocock (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), 13–14.

¹⁶ James Harrington, *The Political Works of James Harrington*, ed. J. G. A. Pocock (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1977), 404.

¹⁷ Pocock, *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History* (London: Methuen, 1972), 112.

¹⁸ Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1986), 262.

¹⁹ Ashcraft, 252.

²⁰ Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, *The Spectator*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 5 vol. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 2:186.

²¹ Addison and Steele, 2:188.

²² Ashcraft, 272.

²³ Ashcraft, 270.

²⁴ Ashcraft, 263.

²⁵ Lars Magnusson, *Mercantilism: The Shaping of an Economic Language* (London: Routledge, 1994), 34.

²⁶ On the role of the National Debt in financing Britain's wars in this period, see John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688–1783* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 114–26.

²⁷ Jonathan Swift, *The Examiner; and other pieces written in 1710–11*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), 5. On the “country ideology,” see H. T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977), 163–92.

²⁸ Crawford, 97.

²⁹ O'Brien, 163.

³⁰ See Antony Low, *The Georgic Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1985); and Alastair Fowler, “The Beginnings of English Georgic,” in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986), 105–25.

³¹ Virgil, *Georgics*, in *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–VI*, with an English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, rev. G. P. Goold (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1999), book 1, lines 97–99. Hereafter abbreviated G and cited parenthetically by book and line number. On the organization of vines, see 2:279–83; the soldiers are compared to nomadic shepherds at 3:383–88; and the bees appear at 4:67–87.

³² O'Brien, 163.

³³ C. A. Moore, “Whig Panegyric Verse, 1700–1760: A Phase of Sentimentalism,” *PMLA* 41 (1926): 362–401. See also Laura Brown, *Fables of Modernity: Literature and Culture in the English Eighteenth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), esp. 72–88.

³⁴ John Philips, *Cyder: A Poem in Two Books*, ed. John Goodridge and J. C. Pellicer (Cheltenham: Cyder Press, 2001), lines 530–46. This useful edition has line numbers, which the first edition (1708) does not.

³⁵ Philips, 572–89.

³⁶ My thanks to Karen Hartnup for elucidating Virgil's Latin for me.

³⁷ See E. E. Rich and C. H. Wilson, *The Economic Organisation of Early Modern Europe*, vol. 5 in *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1977), 498–99.

³⁸ I am encouraged to read Philips's lines on Tmolus and the Chalybes as describing an import trade by the fact that the *Spectator*, three years later, (mis)reads the same passage from Virgil in exactly the same way. Addison uses it as the motto for *Spectator* 69, a “panegyric on trade” that “becomes for eighteenth-century Whigs one of the classic expositions of the value of the merchant class to the nation” (Addison and Steele, 1:296n2).

³⁹ Philips, 652–69.

⁴⁰ In the absence of any British manufactures for which they could find an Asian market, the East India Company used arbitrage rates, particularly for silver, to fund the purchase of luxury textiles in Asia until the middle of the eighteenth century. See

K. N. Chaudhuri, *The Trading World of Asia and the English East India Company, 1660–1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978), 153–77. The seventeenth century had seen a long-running argument over the imagined drain on national wealth that this represented: for a useful account of this see William J. Barber, *British Economic Thought and India, 1600–1858: A Study in the History of Development Economics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), 8–27.

⁴¹ That the allusion is to a British poet (in the epic, *the* British poet) completes the shift from the equivalent passage in book 1: just as indigenous cider is fated to triumph over continental wine, so Philips's literary reference point is now an indigenous literary authority rather than the ancients. I thus see *Cyder* as a more coherent poem than Rogers, who argues that "the concluding verses . . . on the spread of British commerce have no necessary link with what has preceded them" (437). On *Cyder* as "a landmark in the history of the nationalizing process, in part because Philips imitates Milton," see Crawford, 127.

⁴² *Cyder's* representation of trade is thus rather more interesting than a mere "hostility towards things imported from abroad, kings chief among them" explained by Philips's "Tory insularity" (J. C. Pellicer, "Introduction: The Politics of *Cyder*" in Philips, xi). Apart from anything else, to be Tory in this period does not necessarily involve hostility to imported goods (royal dynasties excepted). As Cosimo Perrotta notes, those writers who "defended freedom of trade" at the end of the seventeenth century "above all in order to defend the luxury imports of the East India Company" were often Tories, such as Charles Davenant and Dudley North ("Is the Mercantilist Theory of the Favorable Balance of Trade Really Erroneous?" *History of Political Economy* 23 [1991]: 307).

⁴³ Pope, "Windsor Forest," in *The Poems of Alexander Pope*, ed. John Butt (London: Routledge, 1989), lines 55–56, 65. Hereafter abbreviated WF and cited parenthetically by line number.

⁴⁴ See Locke, 41.8–10.

⁴⁵ Pellicer, xi.

⁴⁶ See, for example, James Thomson, *Spring*, lines 67–77, and *Summer*, lines 423–31, in his *The Seasons and The Castle of Indolence*, ed. James Sambrook (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 4, 48–49. Book 2 of *The Fleece* describes the dependence of Britain's wool industry on imported materials at lines 565–70 and 603–11 in terms reminiscent of Locke. See John Dyer, *The Fleece: A Poem* (London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1757), 75, 77.

⁴⁷ Kaul, 159, 157.

⁴⁸ Dustin Griffin, *Patriotism and Poetry in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 181.

⁴⁹ John Barrell, *English Literature in History 1730–80: an Equal, Wide Survey* (London: Hutchinson, 1983), 66.

⁵⁰ Barrell, 65.

⁵¹ Beth Fowkes Tobin, *Colonizing Nature: The Tropics in British Art and Letters 1760–1820* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 32.

⁵² Heinzelman, 190–91.

⁵³ Heinzelman, 189.